

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TYRONE HURT,

No. C-13-80012 MISC EMC

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER RE PRE-FILING REVIEW

THE BLACK PANTHER PARTY,

Defendant.

Plaintiff in this case is subject to pre-filing review for all complaints filed in this District pursuant to a January 11, 2013 Order in the case *Hurt v. All Sweepstakes Contests*, No. C-12-4187 EMC (N.D. Cal. Jan. 11, 2012) (Docket No. 18). In that case, the Court found that Plaintiff had filed twenty one lawsuits in the previous year, the majority of which had been dismissed with prejudice for failure to state a claim. The Court found that Plaintiff's complaints are "often vague, confusing, or unintelligible" and that where the substance of his allegations can be discerned, they are often based on specious legal theories. In many of the cases, Plaintiff had brought suit based on sweeping allegations of general societal wrongs to which he had no personal connection. The named defendants were often immune to suit or not clearly identified.


In this case, Plaintiff names the Black Panther Party as a defendant, but his complaint, as best as can be discerned, seems to seek a writ of habeas corpus for certain members of the Black Panther Party who have been imprisoned "allegedly for the murder of a 'white' police officer." Complaint at 2. Defendant does not name the Party members so imprisoned, provide the date or court of conviction, or their current place of incarceration. He provides no facts or argument as to why he

1 has standing to bring a habeas petition on their behalf. In short, the complaint is both profoundly
2 deficient, both factually and legally.

3 The Clerk of the Court is therefore directed not to file Plaintiff's complaint in this matter.
4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.
6

7 Dated: January 29, 2013
8

9 
10 EDWARD M. CHEN
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28